

K. with Tract 6 *3*

A N

699. h. 11
3

APPENDIX

TO THE

PLEA for INFANTS.

In which their

RIGHT to *BAPTISM*

Is farther vindicated,

AGAINST

The Rev^d. Mr. JOSEPH BURROUGHS'S

Attempt to exclude them,

IN HIS

TWO DISCOURSES

Relating to

POSITIVE INSTITUTIONS.

*—Suffer little children to come * unto me, and forbid them not—*

JESUS. *Luke xviii. 16.*

** i. e. be brought, see v. 15.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. BRACKSTONE, at the *Globe* in *Cornhill*. Price 6d.

Where may be had, *The Plea for Infants*. Price 1s.

APPENDIX

TO THE

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

OF THE

ARTS

OF THE

TWO DISCOURSES

POSITIVE INSTITUTIONS

LONDON

Printed by J. Johnson, at the Golden Square, in Pall Mall.

M
dis
TH
led
fati
bet
cip
for
W
No
wit
Te
pac



A N

APPENDIX

TO THE

PLEA for *INFANTS*.



HERE is to be found among us, a *Seet* or *Party* of Christians, who are very apt to express Astonishment, because all who call themselves Christians, are not of their Mind in that very *peculiar* thing in which they differ, or by which they are distinguished. This, every one may easily come to the Knowledge of, who for any time is in free Conversation with an *Antipædobaptist*; for let him be the best natur'd Man, or of the most generous Principles, in all other Regards, he can hardly ever forbear expressing some unseemly degree of Warmth, if his particular Opinion is debated. Nor can he publicly defend his *Peculiarity*, without being in great danger of losing his Temper, and calling in question either the *Capacity*, or *Integrity* of all his dissenting Brethren.

B

Adult

Adult Baptism is so clear a Point, and *Infant Baptism* so dark and ridiculous a one, that he presently is convuls'd with Indignation, and declaims with more than Apostolical Authority.

Now altho it must be own'd that *Truth* does not always side with Numbers, or take up her dwelling with the Majority, yet it seems somewhat wonderful, that she should only have so *small an handful* of Advocates, among the many Parties and Sects that make up the Christian World. Nor only so, but it is amazing that this particular *Feature* of hers, should differ so widely in its Effects upon its *Admirers*, even as to produce an unhallowed, an uncharitable Zeal in every *individual*, in proportion to the Attachment he has for it! For scarce any exception will lie against this Observation.

Hence, One would be tempted to conclude, either that *high Calvinism* was a Truth, and that truly none but a *very small few* of the human Race were elected or chosen of God; and that accordingly the Bulk of Mankind are judicially blinded, and so rendred unable to discern the plainest and most important Truths; viz. that of *Adult Baptism*, together with the Plunging, *i. e.* saving Application of Water! Or, that if this be not the Case, that *Immersion* has some Physical Influence on the *Blood* or *Spirits*. For why so feverish a Flow, whenever this view of the *Rite* is call'd in question? Or, whenever a Defence is attempted? What else can we conclude, when we hear Men so angry with

with Arguments drawn from the *Abrahamic Covenant*, in vindication of *Infant Baptism*, as to deny *that there ever was any such Covenant made with Abraham!* and that *Plunging* is so far from being a *mere Mode*, that it is of the *Nature and Essence* of Baptism.

I am aware some will be ready to say, that two Discourses lately published, on the Subject of *Positive Institutions* is an Exception, nor would I be guilty of detracting from the Character, and Merit of the worthy Author. Nevertheless, I must take the Liberty to make some Remarks, as an Appendix to the *Plea for Infants*.

And I shall begin with *Positive Institutions*, concerning which, I find, that in Order to deter and dissuade from a Neglect and Contempt of *Positive Commands* from plausible Arguments, this is given as an Example, viz. "*That the absolute Necessity of the one, and the manifest Inferiority and Subserviency of the other, is manifest Unrighteousness and Injustice towards God* *." Which Example, can only be defended, from Men's making this a Reason of their wilful Neglect of the Positive Institution; for if it should be understood, as expressing false Ideas of the Distinction between *Positive Commands*, and *Moral Righteousness*, the Example is then itself a false Example, and delusive; for herein is the true distinction between *Positive Commands*, and *Moral Righteousness*;

* Mr. Joseph Burrough's two Disc. Page 7.

the latter being of absolute necessity, and the former manifestly inferior, and subservient to the latter. If therefore such an Example should be intended to express a false way of Reasoning, or a wrong method of forming our Sentiments, concerning the difference between *Positive Commands*, and *Moral Righteousness*, it must be calculated to mislead, not to inform the Mind. It must, forasmuch as this is the plain and manifest Doctrine of all Revelation, viz. *That God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*. Even under the *Mosaic Constitution*, so great was the difference between *Moral Temper*, and *Positive Rites*, or *Commandments*, that *David* tells God, *Thou desirest not Sacrifice else would I give it, thou delightest not in Burnt-Offerings, the Sacrifices of God are a broken Spirit*; i. e. these are the most acceptable Sacrifices, for it does not follow, that because a broken Spirit is called a Sacrifice of God, that therefore, he had not appointed other Sacrifices.

Nor was any Rite more evidently commanded of God, than that of *Circumcision*, see *Gen. xvii. 14. And the uncircumcised Man-Child, whose Flesh of his Foreskin is not circumcised, that Soul shall be cut of from his People: he hath broken my Covenant.* comp. *Exod. iv. 24. 27.* And this Rite was to be applied at *eight Days* old, *Gen. xvii. 12.* And yet this very *Positive Command*, enforced with so strong a Sanction, gave way to *Mercy* for near forty Years together. See *Josh. v. 5. Now all the People that came out were circumcised; but all the People that were born in*
the

the Wilderness by the way, as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had not circumcised. Conforrable to this, the *Prophets* whenever they mention Positive Commands, and Moral Duties together, speak with comparative Contempt on the positive: so *Jer. iv. 4. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the Foreskin of your Hearts.* q. d. your other Circumcision is no manner of Security to you against my fury, therefore circumcise your Hearts, which has an infinitely greater tendency to prevent your ruin; and again, ver. 14. *O Jerusalem wash thine Heart from Wickedness, that thou mayest be saved.* q. d. Your external Washings, or Baptisms, will have no Manner of avail, nor stand in any stead, but your Heart must be baptized, or washed from Wickedness. To the same Purpose is *Mich. vi. 9. He hath shewed thee, O Man, what is good.* Here Sacrifices, and Offerings, tho' positively commanded, are rejected, despised, and trampled upon, as what have no real Goodness in them; no Good when compared with Moral Righteousness, i. e. doing justly, loving Mercy, and walking humbly with God.

Besides our Lord himself shews that Purity did not lie in Meats, but those things which proceed from the Heart defile him; this he said to *Jews*, who were yet under Laws that distinguished between *clean and unclean Meats.* *Matt. xv. 10, 21.*

Nay, even of their *Sabbath*, which he had so strictly commanded them to keep as a Rest from

from all *Manual* or *Bodily* Labour, yet this very Institution was to give way to another more *ancient* Rite, even that of *Circumcision*; See *John* vii. 22, 23. *Moses gave unto you Circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the Fathers, and ye on the Sabbath Day circumcise a Man. If a Man on the Sabbath Day receive circumcision, that the Law of Moses should not be broken, &c.* And in *Mark* ii. 27, he declares, *that the Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath*: which surely he could not have said of moral Rectitude, or of eternal and inflexible Truth.

We should therefore expect to find upon this extraordinary Example, *viz.* Our looking upon the absolute Necessity of the one, and the manifest Inferiority and Subserviency of the other, becoming manifest *Unrighteousness* and *Injustice* towards God——Upon this I say, we must expect to find some manifest Foundation, on which to support *positive Commands*, under the Gospel Dispensation. But alas! never did the *sacred Writers* once think of making the *Eucharist*, or even *Baptism*, to stand in any stronger Light, when compared with moral Righteousness, than in a *manifest Inferiority and Subserviency*, and this without the least *Unrighteousness* or *Injustice* towards God.

That famous Passage of *St. Peter's* of Baptism now *saving* us, not by washing away the Filth of the Flesh, but the *saving Effect* arising from the Answer of a good Conscience to-

wards

wards God, is a sufficient Proof of the Difference to be put between *moral* Truth and *positive* Command. Nor would St. Paul have given so much Preference to his preaching the Gospel, and declar'd, *he was not sent* [so much] *to baptize*, 1 Cor. i. 17. if Baptism was not, in its own Nature, manifestly *inferior* even to that *Mean* of promoting moral Rectitude.

I have thus treated the Example, tho' it is suppos'd to be only a *plausible Reason* of neglecting and contemning positive Commands; forasmuch as this View of *positive Commands* does not appear to me to be a *plausible Reason* why any should neglect or condemn *positive Commands*; for whilst a Man keeps in his Eye the *absolute Necessity* of moral Rectitude, and sees, at the same time, the *manifest Subserviency* of positive Commands, he can never make this a Reason of neglecting or contemning them. So that the *Example* seems rather calculated to throw a false Light before the Eye of the Reader, by leading him to imagine, that the absolute Necessity of *moral Rectitude*, and the manifest Inferiority and Subserviency of *positive Commands*, is but a *plausible and deceptive* View of them: whereas it is the most just and proper way of stating the *real* Difference, that does and must for ever subsist between them.

Besides, there are those who have in plain Terms asserted, " That positive Institutions demand an equal Regard from Christians, " with

“with moral and eternal Truth.” This is indeed to give the *Handmaid* or Servant, an equal Authority with her *Mistress*; and must be looked upon as a Principle that confounds and inverts the very Nature and Difference of Things.

For, was this a true Principle, one would imagine, that the Reason of *positive Commands* should be as plain and intelligible, as are moral and eternal Truths; and if so, that they should enforce and oblige as *early*; which being the Case, a Reason should be assigned why the *Lord's Supper* and *Baptism* are not attended to, as soon as the Child of a Christian becomes a *moral Agent*: for they having an equal Claim or Demand, must be equally plain and evident, or equally promulged and notified, and their Obligation implying an equal Force, must suppose a *moral Necessity* of submitting to, or observing them.

Moreover, if we but preserve the Distinction between *moral Righteousness* and *positive Commands*, tho' they are from JESUS, those *positive Commands* have a manifest *Inferiority*, being only of Value, as they are *subservient* to moral Rectitude; they cannot therefore be of *equal Obligation* on Christians. They cannot, whilst they continue what they are, *viz. positive Commands*. — Nay, to attend upon *positive Institutions*, under the Notion of their being of equal Obligation with moral Rectitude,

tude, would be to *pervert* and *abuse* the very nature and design of them. It would be to regard the *means* as the *end*, to which they are only in friendship instituted as the Means, tho' they are such, without which, it is possible the *end* may be attained.— *

Object. But it is farther asserted, *viz.* that,
 “ in positive Institutions, the *mere* will
 “ of the law-giver, considering who
 “ the law-giver is, is a sufficient rea-
 “ son for the Subject's obedience. It
 “ is this that makes it righteousness to
 “ comply, and unrighteousness, that is,
 “ immorality, to refuse obedience. If
 “ there be good proof of a divine in-
 “ stitution, good proof that God requires
 “ us to use a certain *rite* or *ceremony*,
 “ tho' in our eyes ever so mean, and
 “ tho' we ourselves are not let into the
 “ Design of it; yet to refuse compliance
 “ in such a case, is downright disobedi-
 “ ence, and a violation of God's authority;
 “ which is as certainly immorality, tho'
 “ of a *different kind*, as the breaking
 “ what we usually call a moral precept †.

* See Mr. FOSTER'S *Usefulness, &c. of the Christian Revelation*, p. 275. “ Men shall not be condemned for not under-
 “ standing or seeing the reason and obligation of *positive* pre-
 “ cepts; because they have attained to the *great end* of Religi-
 “ on, which all the *subordinate* duties of it must be designed to
 “ promote ”—

† Pag. 19.

It is true, that *authorative obligation* lays hold of those who are under the commands of a superior, he being one who has a right and authority to prescribe Rules to them.—But then this is not of the nature of *rational obligation*, or that which arises from reason abstractly taken, or the manifest nature and truth of things. It has not the same degree of perspicuity, force, and obligation, as being *just, true, and merciful*; and can in itself have no moral strength, any farther than it has a suitability to promote, *order, rectitude*, or manifests the *good will* of the Law-giver; for *mere will*, becoming the reason of subjection, as it makes the immorality of a *different kind*, as the breaking what we usually call a *moral precept*: so it must be owned to be a *different kind* of obligation. And if it should appear that moral obligation does at any time *take place* of positive institution, or oblige the *Rite* to give way, then it must be confessed, that it is not of *equal* claim and authority; and this we have already seen it does. *Besides*, it does so in the case before us; *for example*, can we not suppose that as to the *Lord's-Supper* and *Baptism*, tho' these appear to be positive Rites belonging to the Christian Church; yet, a Man fully persuaded of their obligation, may see great reason, at times, to forego and not attend the celebration of them. *Nay*, that the celebration of them only becomes his Duty in certain given circumstances. For he may be so situated, as not to be able to commemorate the death of

his Lord, in the *instituted usage*, or method of commemoration.—And altho' he was persuaded of the obligation to Baptism, *nay*, to the having it repeated when of *adult* age, he might be so situate, as to be unable to have it applied to him. Or if he had an opportunity of finding men supple enough to indulge to his opinion, he might be in such an habit of body, as would render it unfit as hazardous to be baptised, *i.e.* if he looked upon *plunging* in water as *essential* to baptism.

But it is, or may be said, “ That should he be so circumstanced, that none near him would *dip* him, it would then be his Duty to travel till he found one.”—

To this it may be replied, that if he were in *poor* and *low* Circumstances, he would perceive that this would be to neglect making a proper Provision for his Family; and therefore if he acted a rational, moral part, he would look upon himself as excused; tho' he was fully persuaded that such *sort* of Baptism was instituted by his Lord. And here, every one must see that *moral obligation*, taking place of a *positive* Institution, must determine the *positive* command to be of inferior nature and force.—

Object. But again it is said, or might be said, “ That the man should travel to be Baptised, tho' ever so far; *nay*, that he ought rather to prefer a long journey

“ to a short one, since herein he would
 “ have the *Example* of his Lord—who
 “ gave an instance of that piety and reve-
 “ rence towards God, which shined forth
 “ in all other parts of his life, by under-
 “ going the fatigue of a journey, *on pur-
 “ pose to do the greater honour to a di-
 “ vine Institution* *.” And again, “That
 “ it was his *meat to do the will of him
 “ that sent him*, &c. was verified *par-
 “ ticularly* in the action of coming to
 “ *John’s* baptism, before he took his mi-
 “ nistry upon him ; otherwise he would
 “ not have travelled from *Galilee* to *Jor-
 “ dan* to be baptized of *John*, when it
 “ might easily have been ordered, that
 “ *John* should come to him” †, which
 “ long journey might and would have
 “ been spared, if the Son of God had
 “ not resolved to shew the *greatest re-
 “ spect* to the command of his heavenly
 “ Father, in the Commission given to
 “ *John the Baptist*” ‡.

From these views, it would certainly be in-
 cumbent, not only on a person situated at a
 great distance from a plunging baptizer [if
John is understood to have been one] but it
 must become universally a *rule of direction* to
 all such, who would emphatically shew their
 regard to Jesus, as an *Exemplar*, viz. their
 chusing to travel a *long*, rather than take a
short way to their baptism; forasmuch, as his

* Pag. 3.

† Pag. 14.

‡ Pag. 3.

long journey would have been spared, or might easily have been spared, but that he resolved to shew the greatest respect to the command, by the length of the way which he went to his baptism.——

It must therefore surely express *too great freedom* with our Lord's example, as above strongly described, to weaken the obligation of it, as we find done *, where it is said " I do not mean, by recommending the active zeal, that we should out of a voluntary humility, put ourselves to inconveniencies for the sake of that, which we may as well perform without difficulty : I do not mean, that a man should streighten himself for that which he can easily come at".

What? did our Lord *verify particularly* his regard to the will of him that sent him, by travelling *so far* to his baptism, " When it might easily have been ordered otherwise; when the journey might and would have been spared, had he not by it designed to shew the *greatest respect* to the command of his heavenly Father"; and can this be a proper christian-like conclusion drawn from it, *viz.* " That we are not to understand this active zeal as *recommendatory* to his followers; and that we are not to put ourselves to inconveniencies for the sake of that, which we may as well perform without difficulty"?—Surely this can be no just, no fair conclusion.—

* Pag. 15.

But

But if it be, may I not take the same liberty with his example, upon the Supposition of his being *dipped* or *plunged*? that active zeal of his in plunging quite over head in water, should not put me to the inconveniency for the sake of that, which I may as well perform without difficulty! —

Object. “ But it is said, that *Baptizo* constantly signifies in the New Testament, to *dip* or *plunge*; if we may be allowed to explain those general passages, wherein no circumstances are particularly mentioned, by others which are very plain and clear; which in all reason we ought to do*.” And therefore if we would be baptized at all, we must be dipped.

What the meaning is of the above assertion, I cannot conceive, since the word is certainly often used in the *New Testament*, where plunging can by no means be understood: particularly, 1 Cor. x. 2. Which passage has sometimes been made use of to explain or illustrate *Men's putting on Christ by baptism*: viz. *As the Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea.* Which if we allow to be a good illustration, as I think it is, than we have an idea of Baptism without plunging. And not only so, but we have an Idea of the Subjects of baptism, *being Parents with their Children.* The new Testament gives us in this place an

* Page 27.

express instance of Infant Baptism, which should have some weight with those who make use of this Text as explanatory of the Christians putting on Christ by baptism; but this by the way. It is an undoubted truth that *Baptizo* does not in the New Testament, always signify to *dip* or *plunge*: so far from it, that in a small tract on *plunging*, lately published, it is shewn, that it is only *taking the thing for granted*; for there is no manner of proof that either *John* or the disciples of *Jesus* did ever plunge when they baptized.—

Object. But it is yet said, “ That there is no
 “ accounting for such Words (as express
 “ mens going down into the water, and
 “ coming up out of the water) if baptism
 “ could be supposed to consist in sprink-
 “ ling a few drops of water, or even
 “ pouring a large quantity upon some
 “ part of the body—and that *John’s*
 “ baptizing *Jesus* himself εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην,
 “ into *Jordan*, as it is emphatically ex-
 “ pressed, *Mar.* i. 9.* clears the Doctrine.

Why this should determine the Point I see not, the *particle* being so render’d rather seems to darken than clear the doctrine of plunging, *John* baptized *Jesus* into *Jordan*. The *preposition* is intelligible when understood to express a being baptized into the Religion of *Moses*, or of *Christ*; so putting on the one or the other. But *John’s* baptizing *Jesus* INTO *Jor-*

* Pag. 28.

dan,

dan, has something uncouth in it, as emphatical as it is, unless it be mystically understood, that he baptized him into the *Faith* or *Profession* of *Jordan*!—Tho' it must be owned that the word is render'd into *Rom. vi. 3, 4. into his Death*, and it is the same word rendered *in*, even so we also should walk *in* newness of life. But in this *Gentleman's* sense, it should be thus rendered—*we should walk INTO newness of life*, as being more emphatical. So *Acts ii. 38.* be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ INTO the remission of sins. And in *Matth. xv. 24.* I am not sent, but INTO the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*. And in *Acts vii. 53.* instead of *who have received the law BY the disposition of angels*, to render it more emphatical, we should read it, who have received the law INTO the disposition of angels.—To go *to*, to be baptized *in*, or by *Jordan*, seems to be full as emphatical, and as proper a rendring of the preposition, and no difficulty will attend the description, tho' we should not suppose our Lord plunged when he was baptized.

Besides, is it not amazing that among the many New Testament accounts of baptism, not one word should ever be dropped about their *laying aside*, or *changing* their garments, if they were all plunged!—Since when our Lord used a baptism only to the feet of his disciples, *St. John* tells us, that he *laid aside* his garment.—*John xiii. 4.*—and can we suppose that 3000 could be plunged in the streets of *Jerusalem*,
and

and no hint of the conveniencies for it, or of the *decency* or *indecentcy* of the performance, or administration of the rite?—*Acts* ii. 41.—

Well, but if plunging should not be essential to baptism, nor the Institution be any other than a *positive* institution, yet, children, *i. e.* infants cannot be the subjects of it. That they should, can by no means be allowed. For,

Object. “ The mentioning *proselyte baptism* among the *Jews*, appears to have no foundation, for, that there was no such practice among the *Jews* in our Saviour’s time, as the baptizing of proselytes, is, at least very probable, from the *Pharisees* asking *John the Baptist*, *John* i. 25. *why baptizest thou, if thou be not the Christ, neither Elias, neither that Prophet.* What authority hast thou to bring up a new religious ceremony? *Mat.* xxi. 25. *The baptism of John whence was it; from heaven, or of men?* *John* i. 33. *John says, that God sent him to baptize with Water* *.

That these texts should determine against the use of *water baptism* among the *Jews*, does not at all appear. As to the *first* text, the Question there put does not naturally, or without force, afford the Sense given it. *viz. What Authority hast thou to bring up a new religious ceremony?* It runs thus, *why baptizest thou, if thou be*

* Page 46.

not the Christ, nor Elias, neither that Prophet? which plainly supposes, that they had some notion of the rite as *sacred*: and thought it fit to be used by the *Messiah*, as the *initiatory ceremonial* into his Kingdom; and nothing could be more natural, if it should be allowed that the *Jews* had thus proselyted.

Nor does *Mat. xxi. 25.* give any further Reason against such practice. *They could not have gloried in it, that John's baptism was borrowed from them.* For altho' they had had the *custom*, or *usage* of baptizing Proselytes: yet they could not say that this was an authority for *John* to baptize the true *Israelites*, or the People who worshiped the true God; and that he should so initiate them into another Kingdom, or polity. Or to say the least, they might possibly know of this usage, and understand it as what might be with propriety used, but were very cautious how they condemned themselves.

As to the third text, *John i. 33.* *John* might well say, *that God sent him to baptize with Water*, tho' they had practised the method of baptizing proselytes, for the reason above mentioned. And *besides* he is opposing his baptism to the baptism of *Jesus*. So that to suppose they had had no such practice among them, would render it very difficult to reconcile the *entire silence* of the Historians about the *Jews* objecting, or enquiring into the nature of the *rite*.

And

And altho' the account is no more than a *Rabbinical* or *Talmudical* account given not 'till 150, or 200 years after our Saviour's time*, when a collection was made of their customs, and traditions, this will not lessen its authority, but rather confirm it; for, the *Jews*, from the time of Christ's crucifixion 'till now, had been *bitter* enemies to the christians; and therefore it cannot be reasonably supposed that they would *invent* an usage, which would so greatly confirm and establish the *christian-baptismal-rite*; and so well account for the introduction of it: and yet this would manifestly be the case, if we suppose those writers only invented the accounts given us of their ancient manner of proselyting. Nay, if we suppose that they invented this account, we must suppose them to have paid a voluntary and known high compliment to the christians, who they knew universally initiated by *baptism*: a Supposition, not easily to be made by any thoughtful, sober, unprejudiced mind.

I shall next take some notice of these writings as I find their character from the hands of some *considerable Authors*; and as *Maimonides* is so often quoted by them, let us first attend to his character, as given by Dr. *Prideaux*; he says, "that out of the Babylonish Talmud, *Maimonides* hath made an abstract, containing only the resolutions or determinations made therein on every case, without the descants, disputes, fables and other trash under which

* Page 47. See *Prideaux* Con. Part I. Page 326, 327.

“ they lay buried in that vast load of rubbish.
 “ This work is entitled by him *Yad Hach*
 “ *Azakah*, and is one of the compleatest di-
 “ gests of law that was ever made, I mean not
 “ as to the matter, but in respect only of the
 “ clearness of the Stile and method in which
 “ it is composed, the filthy mass of dirt from
 “ under which he dug it, and the comprehen-
 “ sive manner in which he has digested the
 “ whole. Other *Jews* have attempted the
 “ like work, but none have been able to ex-
 “ ceed or come nigh him herein. And for
 “ this and other of his writings he is deserved-
 “ ly esteemed the *best Author* among them*.”
 So *Culverwel* calls *Maimonides*, one of the
best among the *Jews* †, and a second *Moses* ‡.

“ Of their *Talmuds* some men have spoken
 “ and wrote with great acrimony as well as
 “ contempt, as tho’ they were nothing at all
 “ but an *heap of blasphemy*.” And from Dr.
Prideaux we may learn, that they had a great
 deal of trash in them. But they are not wholly
 to be thrown aside as of no Service, but must
 be allowed of very considerable use in explain-
 ing the Gospel History, as every one must
 own who reads with care Dr. *Lightfoot’s Har-*
mony of the New Testament. Thus he writes
 in 37 Sec. *On the Parable of the Sower*, “ that
 “ the *Talmuds* are abundantly full of this kind
 “ of Oratory, and so are generally all their an-
 “ cient writers: and they commonly enter up-
 “ on their parables with this preface, *a parable*:

* Connect. P. I. P. 328. † Disc. on light of nature P. 64. ‡ P. 120
To

" *To what is the thing like?* I believe there
 " are many in the world, that have not been
 " farther acquainted with the writings of the
 " *Jews*, than what they have seen quoted by
 " other writers, and yet are ready to censure
 " them of lyes, and fallshoods [which indeed
 " they are not free from] meerly upon want
 " of acquaintance with their Stile of Parables
 " and Hyperboles".

Our blessed Lord has plainly had a reference frequently to their customs and usages, as in that famous passage *Matt. v. 22.* a man's being angry with his brother without cause, exposing him to the judgment; calling him *Raca*, to the danger of the *Council*; and fool, to *Gebenna*: which could not have been so clearly understood but for those Rabbinnical writings, as appears by the *Preface to the Harmony* above-mentioned.

The account given by *St. Luke* of the priest *Zacharias* being of the *Course of Abia*, is not so clearly understood as from the *Talmuds*, both of which speak of the ordering of the COURSES *after the captivity.* Sec. 3d.

About *washings*, referred to, *Matt, xv. 2.* and *Mar. vii. 2, 3.* the Talmudical writings are made use of to good purpose*.

So our Lord's mentioning the *Canaanites*, or *Syro-phœnicians* under the Epithet of DOGS,

* Har. Sect. 50.

Matt.

Matt. xv. 26. is explained by these writings, which say, *that the nations of the world are compared to Dogs*†.

These writings explain the custom of *loosing the Shoe*, or *Shoe-latchet*, as being the practice of Servants in acknowledging their Masters. *Sec. 12.*

That *hyberbolical* representation of the power of faith in *removing mountains*, *Matt. xxi. 21.* is greatly illustrated by the *Talmuds*, *Sec. 74.*

That of *binding and loosing*. *Sec. 52.*

Matt. xxvi. 9. explained by means of the *Talmudical* writings, which remove the great Difficulty attending that Passage, *Har. p. 68.*

And great number of passages have light thrown upon them, as this excellent writer has made manifest.

Let us now take some notice of what he tells us, that these *Rabbinical* or *Talmudical* writers say of their ancient method of *admitting Proselytes**.

And this learned man says, “ that *Baptism* had been in long and common use among the *Jews* many generations before *John Baptist* came, they using this for admission of proselytes into the church, and baptizing men, women, and children for that end.

† *Har. Sec. 50.*

* *Note*, there is a wide difference between their character as *Historians*, and their character as *Religionists*. Their prejudices are not concern'd so much in matters of fact, as in their doctrinal Sentiments. Their writings in the present case may be allowed as good Authority. Since no manner of probable evidence lies against the practice, but much for it.

" *Talm. in Jobamoth, cap. 4 and Moym. in Is-
" sure biah, cap. 13. A person is not a proselyte
" 'till he be both circumcised and baptized.*

" *Id. Chittubeth, cap. 1. A little one they
" baptize by the Appointment of the consistory,
" and Maym. in Avedin. cap. 8. An Israelite that
" takes a little Heathen Child, or that finds an
" Hebrew infant, and baptizeth him for a
" proselyte, behold he is a proselyte.*

" Hence a ready reason may be given, why
" there is so little mention of baptizing infants
" in the New Testament, that there is neither
" plain precept nor example for it, as some
" ordinarily plead: The reason is, because
" there needed no such mention, baptizing of
" Infants having been as ordinarily used in the
" church of the Jews, as ever it hath been in
" the christian church; it was enough to men-
" tion that Christ established baptism for an
" ordinance under the Gospel; and then,
" *who* should be baptized was well enough
" known, by the use of this ordinance of old:
" Therefore it is a good plea, *because there is
" no forbidding of the baptizing of infants in
" the Gospel, ergo, they are to be baptized;*
" for that having been in common usage among
" the Jews, that infants should be baptized as
" well as men or women. Our Saviour would
" have given some *special prohibition*, if he
" intended that they should have been exclu-
" ded; so that *silence* in this case does ne-
" cessarily

“ necessarily conclude approbation to have the
 “ practice continued, which had been used of
 “ old before.” *Harm.* p. 10.

Again, p. 76. “ Those of the *Heathens* who
 “ had come into the church of *Israel* and the
 “ true religion, had been inducted and sealed
 “ into it, by being *baptized*. Talm. in *Jebam*
 “ par. 4, &c. and so that proselyte Sacrament
 “ must be carried and continued among all na-
 “ tions, as a badge of homage and subjection
 “ to Christ, to whom all power is given—
 “ and of the profession of the true God, the
 “ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, against all
 “ false Gods and false worship. Infants born
 “ of Christian parents are to bear this badge,
 “ tho’ when they undertake it, they under-
 “ stand not what they do, because none in
 “ Christian Families should continue without
 “ the note of homage to Christ’s sovereignty,
 “ and this distinctive mark against heathen-
 “ ism.—*he adds*,

“ DISCIPLINE was not of persons already
 “ taught, but to that end that they should be
 “ taught, and if the Disciples understood this
 “ word in Christ’s command after any other
 “ Sense, it was different from the sense of the
 “ word, which the nation had ever used and
 “ only used—the Sense therefore that many
 “ put upon these words, *viz.* that none are
 “ to be baptized but those that are thoroughly
 “ taught, is such a one as the Apostles and all
 “ the

“ the *Jewish* nation had never known or heard
“ of before.” *ibid.*

The custom of thus profelyting, *Ainsworth* likewise asserts very expressly to be the doctrine of *Maimonides* and of the *Jewish Doctors* in general ; in his Notes on *Gen.* xvii. 12. “ By three things, say they, did *Israel* enter into the covenant, by *circumcision*, and *baptism*, and *sacrifice*. *Circumcision* was in *Egypt*, as it is written, no uncircumcised shall eat thereof, *Exod.* xii. 48. *Baptism* was in the wilderness before the giving of the Law, as it is written, sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their cloaths, *Exod.* xix. 10. and *Sacrifice*, as it is said, and he sent young men of the sons of *Israel* which offered burnt-offerings, &c. *Exod.* xxiv. 5. and so in all ages, when an *Ethnick* is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the Majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a Sacrifice ; and if it be a woman, she must be baptised and bring a Sacrifice ; as it is written, *Num.* xv. 15, and as ye are, so shall the stranger be—there were many Profelytes in *David's* and *Solomon's* Days—and the Judges of the great *Sanhedrin* had a care of them ; they drove them not away after they were baptized, out of any Place, neither took they them near unto them, until their after-fruits appeared, *Maimony* in *Mishn.* tom. 2.

E

“ in

“ in Issurei biah, ch. xiii. S. 1—6. 11. 14, 15.
 “ Hereupon baptism was nothing strange to
 “ the *Jews*, when *John* the Baptist began his
 “ ministry. They made question of his person,
 “ but not of the thing itself.”——

Dr. *Lightfoot* says, Sect. 12. of his *Harm*.
 “ The Pharisees came to question *John* about
 “ the authority whereby he baptized, making
 “ no strangeness at baptizing, which had been
 “ so long in use among them.”

Object. But it is said, “ that there is not
 “ the least reason to believe, that Christ
 “ would chuse one of those ceremonies,
 “ and adopt it for a religious institution
 “ of his own, which these men, or their
 “ fore-fathers, of their own heads had
 “ superstitiously framed, and in the prac-
 “ tice whereof they offered to God a
 “ Service which he never required*.”

It might be sufficient, in answer, to say, that
 this is only an assertion, and has no manner
 of proof belonging to it; for this is *certain*,
 that the *Jews* were allowed to admit of profe-
 lytes from among the *Gentiles*; and that there
 were actually many such among them, but
 that they should be admitted exactly upon
 the *same* terms with the *native-born Jews*,
 is not reasonable to imagine; because they were
 esteemed *impure* and *unboly*, and it is but na-
 tural to suppose, tho’ we have not now in the

* See Mr. *Burroughs*’s Two Disc. on positive Instit. p. 48.

Jewish Code any very-particular and exprefs account of the ceremonials of the *Profelytes* admiffion; yet we may by a juft analogy conclude, that fince WASHING was appointed for the legal purification of a DEFILED Jew, it was but reasonable to expect that the fame purifying Rite, fhould be applied to a Gentile Convert, who was looked upon by them as naturally defiled, and therefore as bearing fome likenefs in his condition to a Jew, under legal pollution and uncleanness.—

It is but reasonable to conclude, that God required this fort of ceremonial admiffion; fince he had fo peculiarly diftinguifhed the natives of *Israel*, as an *holy* people, and appointed Water-baptifms for their purifications.—fo that we fee, even at this day, full as clear reason from the ceremonial *Jewish* Laws, for the application of *Baptifm* to the profelytes, as any man in the world can give us of the *christian-infant-feed* being excluded the baptifmal rite, becaufe not expreffly mentioned as the fubjects of it.—I might have faid *much more* reason.

Object. But thefe, *i. e.* infants, muft be excluded, becaufe, “ the Gofpel constitution
“ is compleat in itfelf; and every part of
“ it receives its force, and becomes what
“ it is, from the mind and will of
“ the constitutor; nor is it left to us
“ to fupply its fupposed deficiencies, out
“ of an antiquated constitution, which
“ this was defigned to abrogate. I fay,

“ its supposed deficiencies. For whereas
 “ in the Case before us, some good Chri-
 “ stians suppose, that because Infants
 “ were circumcised of old, by virtue of
 “ an exprefs command, therefore infants
 “ ought to be baptized now, tho’ there
 “ is no command for it; the argument
 “ is directly against them, besides that
 “ they have no precept to proceed by.
 “ For the truth of the case is this: that
 “ the circumcision of infants, if it can
 “ be said to have made them members of
 “ the church, must be a proof of the
 “ weak, infant state of the church in those
 “ times; *when the heir was under tutors*
 “ *and governors, until the time appointed*
 “ *by the father.* But it is an honour to
 “ the christian church, a proof of its state
 “ of maturity and full growth, that none
 “ but grown persons, making profession
 “ of their own faith, and of their own
 “ resolution to obey the mind of God,
 “ are received as visible members of it.
 “ This is, with me, besides the total silence
 “ of Scripture in the case, a good argu-
 “ ment against the baptizing of infants *.

This remarkable paragraph is to shew, that
 there is no room for conjectural inferences from
 the constitution of the *Mosaic* Law, or from
 the *Abrahamic covenant* which went before it.—

* Two disc. p. 42.

What the infant state of the *Jews* has to do with the *Abrahamic* covenant, as an antiquated constitution, designed to be abrogated, I cannot see. Circumcision, the grand point in view in this argument, was not of *Moses*, but of the *Fathers*; and therefore, as we have already seen, one of the most express and strong *positive commands* under the Mosaic constitution, was to *vail* to it, *John* vii. 22, 23. It therefore will not follow, that because children under the *Mosaic* dispensation were admitted as parties in the *Abrahamic Covenant*, that therefore, this was an evidence of the *weak* and *infant state* of the church in those times. On the contrary, the *Abrahamic Covenant* was the highest and most spiritual part of their privileges, and came not in by *Moses*, but was to continue to the end of time, it being the very Christian covenant, the same in nature and essence; see *Gal.* iii. 16, 17, 18. Nor can the most *raised figure* that any language will admit of, take away the force of the argument.— A *Covenant* it was, a covenant *confirmed* of God in Christ 430 years before the Law, and which that Law could not *disannul*. A covenant, referring to, and including Christ the promised Messiah. The *Seal* of which covenant, infants had received under the dispensation of *Moses*, which surely could not be an argument of the *weakness* of this state.—

Nor could it be any honour to the christian church, should it deny *infants* to be parties in
that

that same Covenant of which they always had been parties; and yet never assign one reason why they are unfit, or *less capable* now than they ever have been. But,

It is said, "none but persons of full growth, "making profession of their own faith, and of "their own Resolution to obey the mind of "God, are received as VISIBLE members of "it*."

This *worthy Gentleman*, I am obliged to think, did not intend to *monopolize* to his party the *whole* church; for none but *Antipoedobaptists*, and those who deny water-baptism, do deny Church-membership to infants,—and yet the *Terms* would lead one to suppose, that none but the *adultly-baptized* are *visible* members.—But when I consider his known *Catholicism*, and readiness for *mixed Communion*, I must understand him, as only supposing this to be the plain, settled, certain sense of the Christian Constitution; and even then, I am under some difficulties how to reconcile receiving none but *adultly-baptized* persons as *visible* members, and yet joining with *Poedobaptists* as *visible* members!—

Indeed, I find him giving this comment on *Acts* viii. 37. *viz.* *which supposes, none can be baptized unless they believe* †, "when the Eunuch desired to be baptized, he was told by "Philip, that if he believed with all his heart,

* Page 26, 27.

† Pag. 43.

"he might; plainly intimating that if he did not believe, he might not be baptized."

Let this answer of *Philip's* be made a rule of Baptism, and then none must be baptized, but what believe *with all their heart*. For this, and nothing short of this is in the answer. But if so, no insincere person should ever be baptized. And will any pretend to say, they are judges of the subjects of baptism?— But if they will not, and at the same time, say, that all persons that have received *adult baptism* are the visible members of Christ's church; one may venture to say, *that it is as great an honour to the christian church, and as great a Proof of its state of MATURITY, and FULL GROWTH, to have Infants acknowledged to be its visible members, as numbers of the other sort of visible members; nay, much more so.*

I might further remark, that according to these very advocates for *adult Baptism*, the *rite* itself was introduced and applied during this *weak and infant State* of the Church, *viz.* under the *Mosaic State*, and before the *Christian Kingdom* was actually come. It should therefore follow, upon their own reasoning, that if the Season in which the *rite* was instituted would *diminish* or *destroy* the fitness of it, then *water-baptism* could not have been proper for a *more perfect* and *mature State* of the Church. But we find that altho' *John* introduced this *rite*, as baptizing into a Kingdom that was only coming, yet when it was come, the *same rite*

was

was continued, tho' it had been administred in that *infant, embrio* State, by a man of whom our Lord says, that the *least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he*. Strange ! that yet, this *rite* must not be allowed to infants !

Object. " But it seems *Baptism* must have
 " a view to repentance ; it is designed to
 " exhibit the hope of the pardon of sins :
 " it denotes a personal profession of our
 " believing the doctrine of *Jesus**.

We deny not but grown persons profelyted to the Christian faith, should express their belief in the doctrine of Christ ; which may be looked upon by them as the *doctrine of remission*, as it is so clearly understood by the Gospel. But yet, this will be far from giving us any just notion of a person's having his sins *washed away by Baptism*, who has been from his childhood educated in principles of virtue, and upon his consciousness of having at any time offended, has been truly penitent, and shown it in *new* obedience ; it will not show us how such a person finds baptism to be a *washing away of his Sins*. And yet this seems to be much dilated upon, and expressed with great emphasis. It would therefore be of use in the debate to know, whether an actual pardon and remission, as well as an instantaneous *cleansing* efficacy does attend the baptism of such person ? whether his sins were not washed away before ? and whether he did not before baptism as truly and properly re-

* Page 26, 27.

pent, believe, and obey the Christian doctrine, in every instance that could then be expressed by him? The darkness and obscurity of such representations of the importance and efficacy of water-baptism on the adult christian, by washing away his Sins, will allow one to *doubt* of the fitness of the *rite*, as so applied by adult-baptizers; and especially, as they have neither *precept* nor *precedent* for their practice.

Which one would think, might easily have been had, " for it deserves to be remarked : " that even in the epistles themselves, tho' " written at a time, when many of the first " converts, in the churches to which they " were directed, must have had children grown " up to years of understanding; yet the A- " postles make no mention of any being bap- " tized*."

My view of the doctrine will account for this, which supposes, a great probability of their baptizing them whilst infants: of their whole households being baptized, in virtue of the Parent or Head's professing to believe the Christian doctrine and being himself baptized, as we are assured was the case; so that there was no need for the mention of the baptism of grown children. The multitudes of men and women, the thousands that were together converted, are not likely to have been without their infants with them: it is improbable they should separate from their infants at their baptism.

* Page 59.

And they had as good a right to being baptized with them, as their fore-fathers had, when infants, of being baptized into *Moses* with their parents in the cloud and in the sea. Nor did the *promise* exclude them; the *promise* mention'd *Acts* ii. 38. as belonging to them and to their children, is the argument used by *St. Peter*, for their submitting to baptism, their immediately submitting to it; and therefore if their children were not the immediate subjects of baptism, I cannot see the force of the motive. But it is reasonable *q. d.* "that you should be
 " baptized, for not only you, but your chil-
 " dren are proper subjects of it, nay, even the
 " very heathens that are not yet proselyted, are
 " within the promise." But if the promise be-
 ing to their children, only intended that at adult
 age they might be baptized, it being said to be
 alike to them and to their children, would have
 been no argument for their *immediately* sub-
 mitting to baptism.

It is indeed called a *poor objection* * that we have no example of christian parents baptizing their children; but as poor as it is, no reasonable man in the world who views the interests of Children during *former* dispensations, would look upon it, as of so very contemptible a nature. If children had been denied their ancient privileges, and cut off from being parties of the *same Covenant*, under an easier *rite* of admission, we might have expected some very strong and clear prohibition, with the reason assign'd for it

* Page 58.

Object. It is yet objected, “ that this is the
“ only way or rule of professing christia-
“ nity, viz. by baptism*.”

An objection I despair of ever forming any clear Idea concerning its meaning or import. But it seems that because *baptism* was the proper public rite to the first converts, whereby they acknowledged the doctrine of *Jesus*; therefore all those persons must be in the same circumstances, and the rite be as properly applied to them who have been training up from their infancy in the faith of *Jesus*, and have discovered a serious, voluntary attendance on his word and worship. Methinks, to talk of these men, as not having made a *profession* of the Christian religion, who have for years been forming their tempers and lives by its doctrine and examples, is to talk in a strain the most unintelligible and confounding! In a word, if the rite of baptism be not applicable to the *infant Seed* of christian parents, I can discern no manner of reason for applying it to their *adult* descendants.

For the infant Seed of professing Christians have the most manifest right to the institution.

Object. “ But it is said, that we are not to
“ imagine ourselves at liberty to neg-
“ lect one of Christ’s ordinances, because
“ we have submitted to another, when

* Page 60.

“ it is so plain, that our Lord himself appointed
 “ another ordinance for this very purpose (*viz.*
 “ professing of our Christianity) *after* he had
 “ instituted that of the Supper*.”—

I have found some writers very fond of excluding infants the baptismal Rite, from the *order of the words of Institution*, *viz. teaching or discipling, going before baptizing.*—But surely from this description of the *order of time*, in which it is here said, that the *Supper and baptism* were instituted, one might by *analogy* conclude strongly on the side of receiving the Eucharist before baptism; for our *author* seems to intimate, that it is the duty of persons who have celebrated the memorials of Christ's death, not to look upon that as a sufficient instance of their professing christianity, but they must after this be baptized; *when it is so plain, that our Lord himself appointed another distinct ordinance for this very purpose, after he had instituted that of the Supper.*—Upon which principle one may have a little glimpse how it may be consistent to hold with *mixed communion*, and yet not look upon the *Pœdobaptists* in it as visible Members of the Church of Christ.

Nevertheless, as *John's Baptism* has been acknowledged to be the *rite* to initiate into the *Messiah's Kingdom*, and that our Lord *fulfilled all righteousness*, from his being baptized by him, so one may safely conclude, that notwithstanding our Lord did, *after* his resurrec-

* Page 61.

tion, continue to recommend baptism, yet it was an institution *prior* to these instructions; tho' not understood with so great a latitude, as to the subjects of it. And therefore, such need not distress themselves on account of their having been baptized before they have received the Eucharist.

I shall only add one more remark, and that is deduced from the principle of this *defence* of *positive Institutions*, viz. that a Christian parent, who but weakly discerns the doctrine of Baptism, as including infants among its Subjects, "if he does but see good proof that God requires him to use that certain rite or ceremony, tho' in his eyes it be *ever so mean*, and tho' *he is not let into the Design of it*, yet to refuse compliance in such a case, is downright disobedience, and a violation of God's authority, which is as certainly immorality, tho' of a different kind, as the breaking what we usually call a moral precept.

It is incumbent on those who see this *Rite*, in a light much clearer than the main body of Christians do, that they shew us some reason why *infants* should be excluded from being parties in a covenant, in which they had been ever owned from its first being made with *Abraham*.—

That they shew us a reason why the *Jews* were so silent about it, and made no complaints.
That

That if we must discredit the *Rabbinical* accounts of proselyting, why we may not expect some more substantial reasons for rejecting them in this particular?

We expect likewise to be shewn what improvements are made by Baptism to a grown person, that an infant is not capable of receiving.—

And why the children, infant children of Christian parents may not be baptized now in virtue of the parent's profession of his faith, as well as whole households evidently were upon the faith of their *head*, in the apostolic age?

And that if Baptism is an *initiating* Rite, how it can be said to be *so*, when not applied to persons who profess the Christian Religion, till numbers of years after they have made such profession?

And what is the true standard of moral qualification for baptism? or, that if adult-baptism is of so much importance, as to be an *essential* in the Christian character; how it comes to be so disputable a point? or, why *Adult-Baptism*, and *Plunging* were not more manifest.—

Let it also be shewn, that the baptizing of infants is not a proper instance of their parents professing their faith in Christ, and as proper a pre-engagement on children to be the Lord's,

as that of *Abraham's* circumcising his children and family, was of his faith in God, and in order that they might believe; for tho' *Abraham* believed that he and his children, or family, might be circumcised, yet his offspring or family were apparently circumcised, that they might believe: so that the Christian *Pœdobaptist* in baptizing his infant seed, is manifestly conforming to the method in which men were originally taken into the covenant.——

Once more, how plunging should be looked upon as *essential* to Baptism, and of so much importance, when the *clearest account* given of it, will at least admit of a different Sense, without any absurdity, and may be understood to *sprinkle* or *pour*; as was the *Baptism* of the *Israelites*, and the *Baptism* of the Spirit?

These are some of those things which should be cleared up and explained to us, and would bid much fairer for Success, than calling in question the *capacity* or *integrity* of all that declare for infant-baptism.——

But if upon the most labour'd enquiry, it cannot be shewn, that infants are less the care of heaven than in former ages, and that the *Rite* was never forbidden them, but probably was applied to them by *John* and the *Disciples* of *Jesus*, as well as by the bulk of Christians in all ages. It must then shew too great freedom to burlesque and ridicule the practice; and will discover an unpardonable insolence to charge
I the

the advocates of infant-baptism with selfish and temporary worldly views, as the reason of their attachment; for surely, they may have minds as well disposed to bear reproaches, and to undergo contempt, as those of the *Anti-poedobaptists* persuasion! and from the taste of the age, I cannot but think, that the serious *Poedobaptist* stands as much exposed to the scoff and sneer of men; for it is almost enough to give any thing a good grace, that it has any *oddness* or *peculiarity* in it.—

P O S T S C R I P T.

WHAT has been offered, in the beginning of this *Appendix*, under the distinction of *positive command* and *moral righteousness* or *obligation*, might be farther supported from what Mr. *Burroughs* has said, p. 10. where he asserts, “that it is a downright
 “ absurdity and contradiction, *in its own na-*
 “ *ture*, to reject positive Institutions on the ac-
 “ count of their being *only subservient to moral*
 “ *purposes*; for if they are at all *subservient*,
 “ that is a good reason why we should obey
 “ them.” And no doubt this is a just way of treating positive institutions. But then, how this should ever be esteemed a *plausible reason* for neglecting them, when it is a *down-right absurdity* and *contradiction*, in its own nature, to *reject* them on account of their being *only subservient to moral purposes*, seems

diffi-

difficult to make appear—on the contrary, one would be apt to conclude, that the downright absurdity and contradiction of the thing, would forbid its ever becoming a plausible reason, in the very same point of view, viz. the absolute necessity of the one, and the manifest subserviency of the other.

The above citation is made, in order to shew, that I have the same sentiments with Mr. B. about positive institutions, where he is clear and abstracted in his view of them: and am persuaded with him, “that with respect to external testimony, they stand upon the same foot, as the doctrine to which they refer.” p. 8. for he that said, *I am the resurrection and the life!* also said, *this do in remembrance of me; as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, shew ye the Lord's death till he come, &c.*—But his conclusion, p. 13. viz. “that if our Lord had been baptized without his own consent or knowledge, he could not have been said therein to have fulfilled all righteousness,” I take to be a mere quibble; for Mr. B. should to the purpose have shewn, that our Lord's having been circumcised, was not a fulfilling righteousness, as well as his being baptized; and that the rite of circumcision, which was a fulfilling of righteousness, was performed with his consent and knowledge.

Another observation might be made, viz. that Mr. B's first discourse relating to posi-

tive institutions, lays the greatest stress upon Christ's *fulfilling all righteousness*, in his being baptized of *John*; of consequence, the people's being baptized of him, must be looked upon as an *act of righteousness* in them.—And yet, upon his own principles, advanced in his *second Discourse*, this *fulfilling of righteousness* has no very obvious foundation; for *John* had neither *precept* nor *precedent* for water-baptism, no such thing was ever practised among the *Jews*, and *John* came baptizing with no other credentials, but a *private impulse*! he told the people indeed *that God sent him to baptize*; but he wrought no miracle to confirm his mission.—So that how the *Law* and the *Prophets* were fulfilled by being baptized of *John*, if it had not been the *antient method* of admitting proselytes by water-baptism, is yet to be accounted for.—And surely there must have been requisite some *more explicit rule*, than a private impulse, or such an *emphasis* would not have been laid upon it—but our Lord's *fulfilling all righteousness*, by being baptized of *John*, must have a reference to the same doctrine he taught of himself, *Matth. v. 17. Think not that I am come to destroy the LAW or the PROPHETS: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.*

The END.